

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/611,648	07/01/2003	William B. S. Pressly SR.	MSF-7-CON	2083
22827 7	590 10/07/2004		EXAMINER	
DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449			RODRIGUEZ, CRIS LOIREN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	3763
			D. WE ED 10/02/000	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/611,648	PRESSLY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cris L. Rodriguez	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Ju	<u>ıly 2004</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 40-44 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40 and 41 is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 42-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	•					
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
		•				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	te					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/23/04, 12/15/03, II / Z 0 / 0 3	atent Application (PTO-152)					

Election/Restrictions

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of species a)figures 1-28, claims 42-44 in the reply filed on July 1, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Examiner asserted that no claims were generic, and that applicant asserts that claims 40 and 41 are generic. This is not found persuasive because claims 40 and 41 are not generic since they read only to the non-elected species of figures 29-43.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

- 2. Claims 40 and 41 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on July 1, 2004.
- 3. Please note that claims 40 and 41 have been withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to the non-elected species of Figures 29-43.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

Art Unit: 3763

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

6. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

7. Claims 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 38-40 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,613,952. This is a double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cris L. Rodriguez whose telephone number is (703) 308-2194. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on (703) 308-2698. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/611,648 Page 4

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 4, 2004

Cris L. Rodriguez

Examiner Art Unit 3763